1. Interpretation- The phrase “valued over” in the resolution indicates a prioritization of one mindset over another, not a complete elimination, so the aff advocacy must include both rehab and retribution.
2. Violation- The aff only rehabilitates.
3. Standards
   1. Grammar- To include only one mindset is inconsistent with the word “over”, which indicates a hierarchy, not a complete removal. Otherwise, the resolution would have used the phrase “used instead of”, depicting an absolute comparison rather than a gradual comparison. The text of the resolution is the only thing we have coming into round, thus grammar is a key internal link to predictability and fairness since bad grammar would lead us to have ridiculous unpredictable interpretations of the resolution. Also key to education because they prevent arbitrary divisions of what each side may argue. Education necessitates constructive participation by both debaters to critically engage the arguments presented, which ungrammatical interpretations prevent by creating an unstable basis for evaluation of the resolution.
   2. Fiat abuse- Their interpretation allows them to wipe away a history of combined modes of punishment by solely advocating one theory, when the criminal justice system inherently both attempts to reform and punish—the overlap is way too high to delineate between the two. This destroys fairness because I am at a structural disadvantage if she’s allowed to wave the magic wand and assume solvency when I have to defend the status quo. And destroys education since allowing him to defend a non-implementable alternative means he no longer has to research solvency mechanisms and research success probability.

Voter for fairness because the ballot makes the debate a competition which must be constrained by rules as people only participate with the understanding that they have an equal chance of winning. Also a voter for education because it’s the only lasting thing we have outside of round. Vote them down because a) the abuse has already occurred – my speech time is skewed in order to rectify the abuse putting me behind on substance. And b) it’s not what you do; it’s what you justify. Voting down the debater is the only check against future abuse. Prefer competing interps because reasonability puts us in a double bind either a) the judge asserts an arbitrary brightline which invites intervention or b) we debate about what the brightline is which collapses into competing interps. Theory isn’t an RVI because that commits the fallacy of denying the antecedent—it states if abusive, vote them down, but it doesn’t follow that if not abusive vote for me. Logical appeals preclude your theoretical justifications because arguments must make logical sense before being evaluated whether or not it’s good for debate.